## REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has withdrawn the claim objections, double patenting rejection, and indefiniteness rejections set forth in the November 10, 2003 Office Action.

***Status of the Application***

Claims 1-97 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 86-97 are hereby added.[1] Claims 1-85 have been rejected.

***Obviousness Rejection***

The Examiner has rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): (1) claims 1-4, 6-29, 31-54 and 56-85 as being unpatentable over *Loveman et al.* (US 6,211,869; hereinafter "*Loveman*"), in view of *Clarin et al.* (US 6,414,725; hereinafter "*Clarin*"); and (2) claims 5, 30 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Loveman* in view *Clarin* and a printout from *VideoUniversity.com* (hereinafter "*VideoUniversity*"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the Final Office Action, it is alleged that the asserted combination of *Loveman* and *Clarin* discloses many of the features of independent claims 1, 22, 24, 26, 47, 49, 51, 72, 74, 76, 77 and 78. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that *Loveman* does not disclose that "the edit station comprises a browser to selection [sic - select] portions of the lower

[1] Support for new claims 86-97 is found *at least* in the paragraph bridging pages 4 & 5 of the Application.

resolution content." *Clarin* is then cited for allegedly disclosing an edit station for selecting and specifying a portion of low resolution content.

It is asserted in the Final Office Action that it would have been obvious to use the browser of *Clarin* in the edit station of *Loveman* because *Clarin* allegedly teaches that "browsers are inexpensive, readily available, and provide a familiar graphical interface" (O.A., pg. 5).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to modify *Loveman* in view of *Clarin* as the Examiner alleges.

*Loveman* specifically discloses an editing system using particular fat client software that provides many different functions. *Loveman* provides no indication that this fat client software is in any way deficient with respect to these required features.

Thus, to support the Examiner's rejection, *Clarin* must disclose both a browser capable of use within the *Loveman* system, and the requisite motivation to modify *Loveman* to use such a browser therein. However, *Clarin* is deficient in this regard.

*Clarin* fails to teach or suggest that its browser would be any improvement over the fat client software used in *Loveman*. Further, *Clarin* does not indicate that its browser is capable of performing all of the functions required by *Loveman's* fat client software (*e.g.*, storyboard creation).

Additionally, even if it were possible to modify *Loveman* in view of *Clarin* as the Examiner has alleged, Applicants respectfully submit that neither reference, nor any reasonable

combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the features of amended independent claims 1, 22, 24, 26, 47, 49, 51, 72, 74, 76, 77 and 78.

Considering claim 1, for example, the applied references fail to teach or suggest *at least* "storage for storing the lower resolution content in a fast access storage and higher resolution content in a high capacity storage, wherein the fast access storage is accessible more quickly than the high capacity storage," as required by that claim.

Specifically, although the applied references do disclose storage of different resolution content on different servers, neither reference teaches or suggests that any of the disclosed servers are accessible any more or less quickly than any of the other disclosed servers.

The other independent claims recite similar limitations, and hence are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 22, 24, 26, 47, 49, 51, 72, 74, 76, 77, and 78 are patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2-21, 23, 25, 27-46, 48, 50, 52-71, 73 and 75 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-85 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-85.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

Billy Carter Raulerson Reg. No. 52,156
BILLY CARTER RAULERSON

for Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 20, 2004